Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/646,633	LIGHT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Juliet C. Switzer	1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Juliet C. Switzer*. (3)*Hugh Jones*.

(2) *Donald Zuhn*. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: *04 June 2007*.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *all pending*.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☒ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *See Continuation Sheet*.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

_____
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Zuhn proposed amendments and arguments in response to the previously mailed office action. Mr. Zuhn proposed removal of the language "low risk" referring to HPV types and it was agreed that this would overcome the 112 2nd rejection. Mr. Zuhn proposed amending the description of the HPV DNA probe sets to state that they are "prepared by labeling essentially the full-length genomic sequence of HPV type...," and argued that there is proper written description for this language because, among other reasons, the state of the art provides an understanding of this language and the instant specification describes the probes of the claimed invention as being roughly 6000-8000 base pairs in length. The examiner indicated that the arguments would be considered, but cautioned that the breadth of claim 8 would still encompass detection with the probes at any proportion and this might raise a 112 1st paragraph lack of written description or enablement issue as to what concentrations of probes would meet the functional limitations of the claim. Mr. Zuhn argued that it is within the skill of one in the art to determine the proper probe concentrations given the teachings of the specification. The examiner indicated that this would be considered, and further cautioned that if it is actually a routine optimization then perhaps an obviousness rejection might apply. The examiner pointed out that applicant should take care because on the one hand when referring to the prior art applicant has attempted to argue that the nature of the invention is highly unpredictable and certain aspects would not have been enabled in view of the prior art, but then relative to the broad claim (claim 8 here, for example) applicant sets forth an argument that it would be routine in the art in view of the specification to determine workable concentrations that would meet the functional limitations of the claims. Applicant argued that basis for the portion of claim 9 which recites the different proportions of HPV DNA in the reagent is provided in the specification at page 9 where the specification states that the concentration of probes 16 and 31 were lowered in the reagent to compensate. This is not persuasive because in the same paragraph the specification continues "the percentages of each genomic probe in the DNA cocktail are given in TABLE 2" and table 2 gives specific percentages. Therefore this is a specific teaching of specific percentages, not a generic teaching of any possible "lower" percentages.